RAJYA SABHA

Thursday, the 3rd August, 2000/12 *Sravana,* 1922 *(Saka)*

The House met at eleven of the clock, **Mr. Chairman** *in the Chair*

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Resumption of Indo-Pak Talks

*161. SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD:

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA:

Will the Minister of EXTERNAL AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether United States wants India and Pakistan to resume talks and resolve the protracted Kashmir conflict and put back on trade the derailed Lahore peace process; and

(b) if so, Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): (a) There is no US mediation on Indo-Pak talks. However, the US side has expressed a hope for the resumption of Indo-Pak talks. The *US* side has also reiterated its position, as articulated by President Clinton, namely urging restraint, respect for Line of Control, refraining from violence and for renewed lines of communication. In this context, the US side has urged Pakistan to create conditions for a meaningful dialogue to take place. The *US* Government has also stated publicly on a number of occasions, including on 7th July 2000, that it does not seek the role of a mediator between India and Pakistan.

(b) Government believes that all outstanding issues between India and Pakistan should be resolved peacefully through bilateral dialogue. It is Government's position that Pakistan must create appropriate conditions for the dialogue to start, by stopping its sponsorship *of* and support to cross-border terrorism in India.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: *Sir* I would like to be educated with regard to the first line of the answer...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: You are highly educated.

---

† The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Not in the field of diplomacy, at least, and that too while discussing with your party. It is stated, There is no US mediation on Indo-Pak talks." Sir, part (a) of my question is this. The Minister might have gone through newspaper reports, as everybody has,—that even today's newspapers have reported—that US President Bill Clinton has informed our Prime Minister that he is going to talk to the Pakistani leaders or the leadership of Pakistan to support the peace talks. So, I would like to know from the hon. Foreign Minister as to how does he explain this unusual interest on the part of the United States, and how does he say that there is no mediation? That is why I said in the beginning that I would like to be educated about the meaning of the word mediation'. If this is not mediation, then what is mediation?

Sir, part (b) of my question is this, I would tike to know from the hon. Foreign Minister whether he is aware of the fact that a study group sponsored by one. of the US-based think-tanks has proposed trifurcation of the State of Jammu and Kashmir. If so, what is the response of the Government of India in this regard?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, even though the Question Hour is not an educational class, I would endeavour to explain the matter. I will not go into the dictionary meaning of the word 'mediation'. It is clear enough. Mediation means, two sides, and the third party sitting as some kind of a *Panch.* Wc have seen in other instances. In our neighbourhood, for example; the representative of Norway attempting to clear the road between the LTTE and the Sri Lankan Government.

In this case, as recently as on 7th July, in response to a specific question, the United States Government, through its spokesman, stated, "We do not see ourselves as a mediator." Expression of hope, concern about international developments, situation is very different to playing a mediatory role. Like, for example, the United States expressing the hope in regard to developments in South Asia, India expressing the hope in regard to developments in Sri Lanka, or for that mailer, the West Asian peace talks. This does not mean a mediatory role. It is a part of the expression of concern which most international organisations or bodies or countries indulge in. Therefore, there should be no ambiguity in this regard. Of course, there is no ambiguity. As far as Government of India's response to a study in the USA, recommending one course or another, in regard to the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir, is concerned, let me inform the hon. Member that we do not pay heed to studies.

They are free to carry out whatever studies they wish to carry out. A number of institutions in India carry out academic studies on a variety of international situations. *That, in no* way, either influences or affects the Government of India's thinking on policy in regard to absolute clarity with regard to the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir. Again, I say, Sir, there is no ambiguity in *this respect*

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: Sir, there is a dichotomy between what the Foreign Ministry says and what the U.S. does. The hon. Foreign Minister has cited the example of Norway and Sri Lanka. I am not aware of the fact whether they are in favour of a third party intervention or not. But as far as India is concerned, the consistent policy, even when our Government was in power, has been that there shall not be any third party intervention. So, we cite the examples *of other countries.* They might have accepted third party intervention officially, and they are inviting them. I do not think this is an example which can be cited, as far as our country is concerned.

As far as the second part of the question is concerned, the nation is proud of our soldiers who made supreme sacrifice for the security and territorial integrity of our country while fighting the Pakistanis at Kargil. But, Sir, subsequent to that, the Government, in general, and the Home Minister, Shri L.K. Advani, in particular, in this very House said, "Kargil victory was qualitatively superior *to* the victory of 1971 as India has not only won in the battlefield but also in the diplomatic field. "Sir, it is good enough. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Foreign Minister to what the *U.S.* President, Bill Clinton, said while addressing the joint sitting of Members of Parliament in March, 2000: "I have certainly not come to South Asia to mediate the dispute over Kashmir. Only India and Pakistan can work out the problems between them and I will say the same thing to General Musharraf in Islamabad." To this extent it is okay. Now I quote the operative part: "If *outsiders* can't resolve this problem, I hope, you will create the opportunity to do it yourselves, calling on the support of others who can help, where possible, as American diplomacy did in urging the Pakistanis to go back behind the line of control in Kargil crisis."

I would like to inform the hon. Minister that the Government is now trying to take credit for international diplomacy saying that for the first time, in fifty years, we have such a diplomacy that we can win the support of the whole world. I would like to know *from* the hon. Foreign Minister whether this was a victory for U.S. diplomacy or a victory of the Indian diplomacy.

Thank you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. *Chairman,* Sir, there are two parts of it. One is this that there seems to be some misunderstanding in the hon. Member's mind about what I cited as an example between interests, expression of interests and mediation; and when I cited the example of Norway playing a role in Sri Lanka, it is not to suggest that there is any role being played here of any similar or corresponding kind, and arrange third party intervention in India's internal affairs or particularly in the case of management of the situation in the Indian State of Jammu and Kashmir, let there be no ambiguity or doubt in the hon. Member's mind. The second question really does not arise from the US aspect. The suggestion.....*{Interruptions)*... I will answer it. Do not worry. Do not be impatient. It does not strictly arise *because* the hon. Member's question really relates to the US mediation. And what the hon. Member has done is to stretch the US mediations cite the visit of the US President wherein he said, "We are not mediating." And thereafter he said, "We did have a role to play *on* leaning on Pakistan and urging them to withdraw beyond the line of control." On that the hon. Member wants me to explain whether it was a success of Indian diplomacy or US diplomacy. I am not in a competition game. The reality is for the world to see; the reality is for India to see. And if persuaded by partisanship or political consideration, the hon. Member wishes to derive *some* different interpretation to the interpretation that we have, he is perfectly free to do so.

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD: *Sir,* I take strong objection to the words *used by* the hon. Minister because this is something which the President of the United States said while addressing the Members *of* Parliament, the Indian Parliament. As a Parliamentarian, I could not put this question to the US President. It is the Foreign Minister who has to reply to this question because while addressing the Parliament, he said, "It was at our instance that it was *done."* Instead of accepting that, they cried hoarse, "we, we, we". They should have accepted it .....*(Interruptions)*... Now they are blaming us that it is partisan attitude. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: "We, we, we," and everybody knows it. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SANTOSH BAGRODIA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I will go a step further than my colleague. The second sentence of his reply is, "However, the US side has expressed a hope for the resumption of Indo-Pak talks." I am *not going* further on this. But the last *sentence of the* first paragraph says," ..it does not seek the role of a mediator between India and Pakistan." I wish if you had added, "unless both agree" because this was the attitude of the US President

also. Addressing the National Committee of the Democratic Party at a dinner - meeting in Baltimore before leaving *for* India, he said, "We are working on the peace processes, from Northern Ireland to the Middle East, and I am going to the Indian subcontinent at the end of this week." Sir, my pointed question is: Has the US ever offered its services to mediate between India and Pakistan on the Kashmir issue? Have they ever assured you on this issue? Are you making any effort so that the US can declare Pakistan a terrorist State?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, there are two different questions here. First, "has the US ever offered mediatory role", the reply is quite clear, Sir, No. Secondly, "Has the suggestion been made that Pakistan be declared as a terrorist State" On a number of occasions public statements have been made in this regard that demonstrable action by the Government of "Pakistan and the support that it continues to lend to cross border terrorism warrants such an action being taken. No formal request, however, through diplomatic channels**,** has ever been made.

डा. महेश चन्द्र शर्मा: क्या विदेश मंत्री जी यह बताने का कष्ट करेंगे कि पाकिस्तान के साथ जो हमारे तीन युद्ध हूए हैं उन में कौन कौन से पाश्चात्य देश भारतवर्ष के समर्थन में खड़े हुए थे। सामान्यतः इन युद्धों में अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मंच पर भारत ही कटघरे में रहा है, क्या 1999 के युद्ध में स्थिति उससे कुछ भिन्न थी?

श्री जसवन्त सिंह : सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य ने जिन तीन युद्धों का जिक्र किया है मैं समझता हूं कि शायद वे 1948,1965 और 1971 बात कर रहे हैं। वैसे यदि देखा जाए तो अपने आप में कभी मीडिएशन हुआ तो सन् 1948 के बाद युनाटेडनेशन्स का हुआ, सन् 1965 के बाद रूस का हुआ ताशकन्द में। ताशकन्द का समझौता उसी की उपज थी। सन् 1971 के बाद इस प्रकार की मीडिएशन की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं रही। 1971 में जो हुआ सबको उसकी जानकारी है की संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका का बेड़ा बंगाल की खाड़ी तक पहुंचा था और संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका की ओर से 1971 में भारत को कई प्रकार की चेतावनियां भी दी गई थी। सन् 1999 के अनुभव उससे भिन्न रहे। मुझे नहीं लगता की किसी भी देश ने जिस प्रकार से भारत ने उस हमले का सामना किया, कोई ऐसा देश नहीं है जिससे भारत के हमले का सामना करने के तरीके को सराहा न हो, 1999 ही यह पहला उदाहरण है।

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, through you, I draw the attention of the hon. External Affairs Minister to (b) part of the reply. The-Government believes that all outstanding issues between India and Pakistan should be resolved peacefully through bilateral dialogue. It is Government's position that Pakistan must create appropriate conditions for the dialogue to start by stopping its sponsorship and suppart to terrorism *in* India. Now, even the latest incident

of day-before-yesterday shows that there is no relenting so far as Pakistan is concerned, in the sponsoring of cross border terrorism. Here, it is good to see that the Government is reiterating the position that there wouid be no third party mediation. Therefore, the question that is agitating not only me but the whole country is, how to go about in trying to normalise the situation in Kashmir. Opening a channel of dialogue only with the Hizbul Mujahideen will not suffice because experts say that a bulk of the terrorists are actually being controlled by the group which is close to the Pakistan leadership and Pakistan Government. How to go about it? What are the plans? If the External Affairs Minister is kind enough, he can give a broad road map of what is our thinking at this point of time.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, this question has been answered just yesterday by the hon. Home Minister. It is, of course, a collective and joint effort by the Home Ministry and the Ministry of Defence as also the Ministry of External Affairs. It is very clear, Sir, that we have to be absolutely unflinching in our resolve, firstly, to defeat terrorism of any and all variety in the State of Jammu and Kashmir or elsewhere in the Republic of India. Secondly, Sir, we have to be committed to the path of peace unwaveringly and constantly, never shy of progressing with any step that will lead to peace, not simply in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, but in other parts of India as well, and, thirdly, so far as internal management goes, as my colleague, the Union Home Minister, informed the House yesterday, the Government and all must address themselve to issues that generate discontent within our citizens as for example issues relating to unemployment, lack of income, issues of that variety. Internationally, Sir I do make bold to assert that it is only after the Kargil mis-adventure of Pakistan that cross-border terrorism or international terrorism has now come to the forefront on the international agenda and features not simply in the bilateral talks that India has but it is featuring in the statements that are being issued from a variety of international bodies the U.N. the G-8 Countries, and in the recently held meeting of the ARF, in Bangkok. And, in that regard, 1 am quite happy to inform the hon. Member that India is sponsoring, in the forthcoming U.N. General Assembly Meeting, a comprehensive convention on international terrorism and we have already received a fairly widespread support in this regard.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the President of the USA, as per reports in the media, had talks with our Prime Minister over telephone regarding the indiscriminate firing at the Amarnath Yatris. This itself clearly shows that this is the result of the diplomatic exercise by

our External Affairs Ministry. We feel it is a victory for the Government of India. In this context,, what I feel is,, mediation is totally different from informal consultations with countries. Therefore, what I would like *to* know after the visit of the President, Mr. Clinton, to India *of course,* subsequently, he had been to Pakistan, though *it* was a short visit whether the Government of India has received any feedback from the President of the USA regarding the cross-border terrorism being indulged in by Pakistan. Whether any advice has been given to Pakistan by the USA? Have we received any feedback from the USA? If yes; what action has so far been taken by the Government of India or what action is proposed to be taken by the Government of India? Thank you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, Yes. We have,, as the hon. Member knows, announced one of the decisions during President Clinton's visit to India. In fact, implemented just before that, was the decision with regard to establishing a Joint Working Group on terrorism between USA and India. That Joint Working Group has already held two meetings and there is a fair degree of co-operation exchange of information on many items, including and particularly, cross-border terrorism. Just before coming here, I was made available a statement that has been formally issued by the *U.S.* Government about the outrage committed against humanity if I may say so. I would not read out the whole thing. The statement says "The wanton acts of inhumanity are clearly aimed at undermining the cease-fire declared last week by the Hazibul Mujahideen and the Indian security forces. We condemn these outrageous and inhuman massacres. We extend our deep-felt condolences and welcome the statement of the Indian Prime Minister that India will continue to pursue the path of peace." We constantly keep in touch with other countries; not simply the USA. Now, in regard to cross-border terrorism for example there is a close working between India and the Russian Federation and also a number of Central Asian Countries. Therefore, on the issue of cross-border terrorism there is a much greater recognition and awareness in the international community. And, I make so bold as to repeat that this is one of the consequences of the management of the situation; post-Kargil mis-adventure.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: *Sir,* American sympathy for us is welcome. Also welcome is President Clinton's offer to"talk to Musharraf, conveying our concern. However this aspect has to be taken note *of.* On the *one* hand, they are supporting Pakistan diplomatically and financially. They are endowing Pakistan with full power in all aspects to wage cross-border

terrorism in order to create strife in the country. On the other hand, they are shedding crocodile tears. But we are for peace. You try to settle the issue. Hon. Minister, in his reply, has said that the United States has urged Pakistan to create conditions for a meaningful dialogue. Sir, the capacity to create such a congenial atmosphere lies with the United States and not with Pakistan. Can you insist that the United States should restrain itself from arming Pakistan, and use its influence on the IMF and the World Bank not to finance Pakistan, and declare it a "terrorist state" so that sanctions may be imposed on it? The solution lies there. Will the hon. Minister respond to this point?

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman,, Sir, first of all, I would like to say that it has never been this Government's approach that a great country, like India, should depend on other countries to find a solution for combating the challenges that we face, whether through encouragement of cross-border terrorism by Pakistan or any other challenge. Our approach, in this regard, and our conduct of Relations with the United States is governed or determined by the approach that they have in their bilateral relations with any other country in such matters. That is the second part of it. It is however, an objective reality that a great change has taken place in the attitude, approach and fundamentals of policy, so far as the United States and its relations with our western neighbour, Pakistan is concerned. The third part-which is also a reality-is after all, the United States did, for decades, invest in Pakistan Militarily, economically, diplomatically. Pakistan has been an ally of the United States of America. I need not cite all this. From the position of being an ally and a kind of a fulcrum, whether for access to the People's Republic of China, or for opening up People's Republic of China access to surveillance in the former Soviet Union or for activities in Afghanistan, Pakistan has played a role of virtually an instrument of US policy in this region. The change that has taken place is precisely this. The United States, post 1999, now sees that this no longer subserving the national interests of the United States of America or indeed subserving the larger interests of the South Asian region as a whole. That is the change that has taken place. When we engage with the United States of America, we engage on much broader terms, in this regard, not as if we, a great country, like India was somehow asking the United States to intervene in the matter.

SHRI KULDIP NAYYAR: Sir, I would like to know whether it is a fact that there is an American influence in bringing about the ceasefire on the LoC; not otherwise. The US Under Secretary, Mr. Pickering visited Islamabad. After that, there has been ceasefire on the LoC. Is it a fact?.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: **S**ir, two aspects have been raised. Mr. Pickering has certainly visited Islamabad recently. As indeed, I believe, he visited India too, though he did not meet me. But you said that there is now a ceasefire *on* the Line of Control. No; there is no ceasefire. The impression that you have is misplaced.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE. The hon. Minister has stated that there is *no* mediation in the Indo-Pak talks. And that the US reiterated its position on 7th July,, 2000 that it has no intention of playing the role of a mediator. But the fact is, as per the *US* President's claim, US diplomacy played a major role in the decision of Pakistan not to go beyond the Line of Control during the Kargil crisis. Interest has been shown by the *US* not only after this massacre; even when President Clinton visited India certain killings took place here, he said that it was because of his presence that the extremists resorted *to* these killings. All this may appear to be a disjointed action to the various think-tanks which are operating but surely to the Foreign Minister of the country. They are doing it. We may like to accept it, or, we may not like to accept it; but this is a hard fact. Because of the situation which is prevailing in the international arena they have interest. Surely, the Foreign Minister is aware of the fact that the P-5 countries when both India and Pakistan have become nuclear States, though unrecognised by a special resolution of the *Security* Council, have soma sort of a mandate. Therefore, they are playing the role of a mediator. There is no denying to this fact. This cannot be a strange coincidence. The hon. Foreign Minister has compared this interest with the West Asian peace talks; but what is the West Asian peace talks. If I have heard him correctly, starting from the days of Camp David Pact between President Mubarak and the Israeli leaders, to the latest series of talks between Shimon Parez and Arafat, was it not a mediation? If you do not want to have that particular word, all right. But the point is, if I understand correctly, their position was that they did not refuse to play the role of a mediator. The position which they took was, if both sides agree, then they will be prepared to play the role of a mediator. It is not that they are uninterested. Observations were clearly made that if a bilateral resolution of the problems was not possible, then he had advised addressing the Members of Parliament at the joint sitting that India should try to take the help of other to resolve this issue. I would like to know from the hon. Minister how else he can interpret it.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, with due regard to hon. Pranab babu, who himself has held this portfolio, let me disabuse him of two or three misimpressions. Firstly, I cited the example of West Asia peace talks

as an example of mediation, in contrast to what is happening in India; that there is no mediation and there will not be a mediation. If I cited Tashkent, I cited Tashkent as an example of mediation between India and the Pakistan by the then USSR. What is taking place now is not a mediation. Please let me disabuse him of this misimpression. Indeed, every dignitary of any country who has come has said. Lately, for example, my distinguished counterpart, the hon. Foreign Minister from the People's Republic of China, who came here, also in a statement said that it was his expectation that the issue of Jammu and Kashmir shall be settled between India and Pakistan. Would you, therefore, interpret that expression of opinion of the Foreign Minister of China is an attempt to mediate? It is not .... *(Interruptions).* ..It is not. ...*(Interruptions)*...As far as the United States of America is concerned, it is very clear, what I am saying is that there is no mediation. They themselves have said so. We do not accept mediation and shall not accept mediation. There is no role for a third party to play in this regard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we will take up the next question, *i.e.* Question No. 162 ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: Sir, for the second time, I have raised my hand for putting a supplementary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There were 15 Members who wanted to put supplementaries .... *(Interruptions).* We have spent 35 minutes on this. ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: Sir, very invidious message is going across to the nation because... *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no partiality with anybody ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.P. SINGHAL: When long speeches are made by senior Members ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have spent 35 minutes on one question. Now, Question No. 162.

घरेलू नौकर

*162. **श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र :** क्या श्रम मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या यह सच है कि 18 वर्ष से कम आयु के बहुत के से बच्चे (बालक/बालिकायें)मध्यम और उच्च वर्गीय घरानों में नौकर का काम करते हैं;